



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/214,001	12/24/98	KUDO	H P17380

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN
1941 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON VA 20191

IM61/0313

EXAMINER

VARCOE JR., F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1764

13

DATE MAILED:

03/13/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/214,001

Applicant(s)

Kudo et al.

Examiner

Varcoe

Group Art Unit

1764



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Varcoe

(3) _____

(2) Arnold Turk

(4) _____

Date of Interview Mar 13, 2001

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 30

Identification of prior art discussed:

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant explained that claim 1 is a merger of an earlier version of claim 1 and dependent claims. Paragraph 112 rejections, then, apply to text that could have been rejected in an earlier action. Examiner did not find the text in earlier dependent claims. With regard to claim 30, the §112 "indirectly" "directly" problem was present in an earlier version of claim 30 and was not at that time pointed out by examiner. Applicant requested that the last Office action, Paper number 12, mailed February 9, 2001, be changed from Final to Non-final. That change will be made. Applicant plans in his next response not to amend claims to avoid art, but rather to fix the 112 problems and present arguments. First, he wants to communicate the results of this interview to his client.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.